

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 18-19 22 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Roccetti et al (“The structuring of a wireless internet application for a music-on-demand service on UMTS devices”, March 2002, ACM press (hereinafter “Roccetti”) in view of Anderson et al (US 2002/0194307 A1 (hereinafter “Anderson”). Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson in view of K. Chen et al. (US 2004/0044731A1) (hereinafter “K. Chen”). Claims 5-8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson in view of Langseth et al. (U.S. 6,671,715) (hereinafter “Langseth”). Claims 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson in view of Y. Chen et al. (“iMobile EE: an enterprise mobile service platform”, July 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 9, Issue 4) (hereinafter “Y. Chen”). Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Anderson and K. Chen. Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Langseth. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Y. Chen. Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson and further in view of K. Chen. Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson, and further in view of Langseth. Claim 25 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson and further in view of Y. Chen.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 22 have been amended. Applicants submit that no new matter was introduced in the amendment of the claims. Claims 6, 8, 9, 11 and 24 have been cancelled.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On February 27, 2008, Examiners Michael Lai and Yves Dalencourt and Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the

interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiners Lai and Dalencourt agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 18-19 22 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Roccetti et al (“The structuring of a wireless internet application for a music-on-demand service on UMTS devices”, March 2002, ACM press (hereinafter “Roccetti”) in view of Anderson et al (US 2002/0194307 A1 (hereinafter “Anderson”). Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite in part a fax server and the fax server forwards selected content and destination information to a fax service provider. The fax service provider faxes the selected accessible content to the one or more devices designated by the web-enabled device. Support for this amendment can be found for example in the discussion found in paragraphs [0022] to [0025] and FIGs. 3 and 4.

The cited Roccetti et al. reference in combination with the Anderson reference fail to teach or suggest the above added limitations. Roccetti teaches a system for downloading of MP3 songs from a distributed network to a requesting device. As mentioned in page 1068, col. 2, paragraph 2 of Roccetti, when Roccetti requests a certain MP3 song from the server, the server via the Download manager sends the requested song back to requesting device if it is available. The Anderson teaches retrieving selected documents from a server in response to receiving a request email message and sending the selected documents to a destination address for printing.

Since independent claim 1 has been amended to recite in part “forwarding the selected content and destination information to a fax service provider” similar to was previously recited in dependent claim 11, the cited Langseth reference which discussed sending selected content to a fax service also needs to be discussed here. Applicants respectfully disagree with the reason as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have any motivation to combine Langseth with Roccetti and Anderson. In page 9, second paragraph of the Office Action it was mentioned that “the motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti’s and Anderson’s system would be to enable delivering the selected accessible content in yet another way to the user”. Given that the main cited Rocetti reference is teaching a system for

DOCKET NO.: 302767.1 / MSFT-2571
Application No.: 10/692,435
Office Action Dated: November 29, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

downloading MP3 music songs, applicants simply cannot find any reason for why one of ordinary skill in the art would even attempt to combine Langseth's teaching of using a fax service provider with the Rocetti music download system. Not to mention that this would technically not work at all. As such, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Given this, it is believed that claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5, 7, 10 and 12 that depend on claim 1 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 13 has been amended in similar fashion to independent claim 1 and as such it and its dependent claims 14-17 are also believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. Independent claim 18 has been amended to recite in part *"forwarding the selected content to a fax service provider for faxing the selected content to the designated device selected by the web-enabled device"* and as such it is also believed to be in condition for allowance for the same reasons made above. Support for this amendment again can be found in the discussion relating to FIGs 3 and 4. Dependent claims 19-23 and 25-28 which depend on claim 18 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: 302767.1 / MSFT-2571
Application No.: 10/692,435
Office Action Dated: November 29, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: February 29, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439